UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/772,025	02/03/2004	Hank Risan	MOMI-025	5340	
	7590 01/16/200 FS TECHNOLOGIES :	9 C/O WAGNER BLECHER LLP	EXAMINER		
123 WESTRID	123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE			MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	
WATSONVILI	LE, CA 950/6		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2431		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/16/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/772,025	RISAN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	ARAVIND K. MOORTHY	2431					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	J. nely filed the mailing date of this co					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Oc</u>	ctober 2008						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the	merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.	•						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
•	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <i>03 February 2004</i> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 LLS C & 119(a)	-(d) or (f)					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 0.5.6. § 115(a)	-(a) or (i).					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stane				
application from the International Bureau	•	a in this reational	Olago				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attacker and a							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔛 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [Other:						

Page 2

1. This is in response to the arguments filed on 21 October 2008.

2. Claims 1-35 are pending in the application.

3. Claims 1-35 have been rejected.

Response to Arguments

DETAILED ACTION

4. Applicant's arguments filed 21 October 2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

On page 9, the applicant argues that the application was filed on 2/3/2004

and as such could reasonably be expected to cover versions of the claimed matter that

were either operational or available on that date such as backward compatibility.

Further, the inventive aspects would clearly be expected to cover any versions that

would reasonably enable one of skill using the detailed description of the instant

disclosure without undo experimentation.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant's remarks are just a general

allegation indicating that all types of versions are applicable to the claimed trademarks.

The applicant makes a mere allegation that "could reasonably be expected to cover

versions of the claims matter that were operational or available on that date such as

backward compatibility." If this is the case, which versions were known to the applicant

at the time of filing of the instant application? The applicant has failed to specifically

identify which version of iTunes[™] and iPod[™] was known to the applicant at the time of

filing of the instant application since versions of iTunes™ and iPods™ are known to

constantly change over time. The applicant's specification fails to define any specific

Application/Control Number: 10/772,025

Art Unit: 2431

version or type of iPod™ and iTunes™. Similarly, no specific version of windows operating system or Mac[™] operating system has been identified by the applicant, nor are they described in the applicant's specification. The claims contain the trademark/trade name iTunes™, iPod™, Windows™, and Macintosh™. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See Ex parte Simpson, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe operating system and media player types and, accordingly, the identification/description The comments made by the applicant are not satisfactory in is indefinite. order to overcome the rejection under 23 USC 112 2nd paragraph. The examiner requested specific evidence as to what version and/or types are relevant to the trademark terms and the applicant has failed to provide that evidence. The rejection is hereby maintained by the examiner.

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25-31 and 34 contain the

5. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

trademark/trade name iTunes, iPod, Macintosh and Windows. However, the applicant has not specified which version of iTunes is being claimed. The applicant has not

specified which model of iPod is being claimed. The applicant does not specify which

version of the Macintosh and Windows operating system is being claimed. The

examiner asserts that there were various versions of iTunes and Macintosh and

Windows operating systems available at the time of filing of the current application. The

examiner asserts that there were different models of the iPod available at the time of

filing of the current application.

Any claims not directly addressed are rejected on the virtue of their dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-35 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action

Prior art does not disclose, teach or fairly suggest controlling a data output path

carrying media content of a client system with a compliance mechanism by diverting a

Application/Control Number: 10/772,025 Page 5

Art Unit: 2431

commonly used data pathway of a media content presentation application to a

controlled data pathway monitored by the compliance mechanism.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ARAVIND K. MOORTHY whose telephone number is

(571)272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aravind K Moorthy/

Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Christopher A. Revak/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Application/Control Number: 10/772,025

Page 6

Art Unit: 2431